

8
For the Library of the
College of Surgeons.
From the Editor
(Edwards Esq)

THE HISTORIES

OF THE

COLLEGES OF PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS,

AND OF THE

APOTHECARIES' COMPANY.

Including the Manuscript Annals of the London College of Physicians,
from 1682 to 1749.

With the Editor's Plan of Medical Reform.

Reprinted from the *London Medical Examiner* and "*One Faculty*" Journal.

C

JUNE, JULY, AUGUST, 1851.



by the
AUTHOR.

Extracts from the Registers of the Royal College of Physicians of London, from 1682 to 1749: By JOHN LEWIS PETIT, M.D., Coll. Regal. Med. Lond. Soc., S.R.S., and S.S.A. Manuscript 3 vols., including 21 books of the College Annals. The books are described, and the pages given. Library of the Medical Society of London, perfect.

We have, in the last three numbers of our Journal, given the statistics of the medical profession; the present status of the general practitioner; and the position he is likely to occupy if he allow himself to be taken into the custody of the Colleges of Surgeons and Physicians. It will now be our business to place before the general practitioner the history of these corporations, so that he may not hereafter, if he should fall into the trap that is laid for him, have the excuse of ignorance. He should take warning from the past, and be forearmed.

By a most fortunate and opportune circumstance, we have discovered in the library of the Medical Society of London, the three volumes of manuscript above-named. Their authenticity is undeniable; and they fill up a gap in the records of the College of Physicians which we believe would otherwise remain vacant. They were in the possession of Mr. Warburton during the Parliamentary Enquiry, 1834; but, as far as we know, they have never been made public.

Before we commence our review of these annals let us, in a few words, give a brief history of the College of Physicians. The six physicians whose names are recorded in the charter took their degrees at foreign universities. Harvey, and the most celebrated men connected with this college, obtained the foundation of their knowledge in other countries. The charter was granted in 1519 (Henry VIII.), to prevent ignorant persons practising medicine and surgery; but this only applied to those persons practising in London, and within seven miles thereof. Previous to this the Bishop of London, or the Dean of St. Paul's, with four Doctors of Physic, licensed for London, and the Bishop, or his vicar-general, were the scrutators of the provincials. This charter empowered the college to make *lawful* ordinances or bye-laws. The corporation consisted of a president, four censors, and eight elects, *as at present*. The former for the examination of the metropolitan practitioners, the latter for the provincial; all self-elected. The candidates were to be "profound, sad, discrete, groundly learned, and deeply studied in physic." In 1688 this college, in an address to its members, expressed its determination that the profession "should not be invaded by the vulgar, which had been the usual support of the younger sons of the gentry of the kingdom." The reader must also bear in mind that the charter stated that all medical men who practised medicine were to undergo a practical examination, and that this college was spoken of as a "commonalty." The iniquitous bye-laws, afterwards passed, rendered the institution one of the most despotic of the "rotten corporations" of the country, as our analysis of these annals will show:—

"Dr. Gideon Harvey, physician to the king, 1686, says, 'This famous conclave

is the eldest quack synagogue, consisting of a phisic pope or patriarch, and a competent number of medical cardinals, who being grown ancient, covetous, and, through forgetfulness, ignorant, are to govern the rest; and, whenever they are consulted, they are to impose upon the juniors their pretended long experience, which they are to embrace with the same impleit faith the Turks do their Alcoran. But, if refractory, they are to be convened before Il Consiglio Picolo, which is their purgatory, whence they may be received again into the bosom of the conclave; but if, afterwards, they prove incorrigible, the conclave sits upon them, and they are then damned, and utterly expelled, without redemption. Thus, in my time, I have known several poor wretches damned."

Dr. J. A. Wilson, in his Parliamentary Evidence, 1834, says (question 1610):—

"I would wish, on many accounts, to have the entire body of physicians in this town really represented in the College; and to avoid all heart-burnings and jealousies, and possible canvassing among friends for the purposes of election, I would wish, as much as possible, to do away with all analogy between the College of Physicians, and the clubs in the neighbourhood of the College. 1611. What clubs do you allude to?—The clubs generally of the town. I should wish to do away with all exclusive distinction of the fellows that was not founded on medical attainments and general character. 1612. Does the statute still exist requiring a person, before he becomes a candidate or fellow, to call upon the president, and each of the fellows resident in London and seven miles round it?—*It does*; before he applies to be examined as candidate, or inceptor candidate."

But let us beg the especial attention of all who are desirous of reseuing the profession of medicine from its present state of degradation, to the laws of this college, which now remain in full force; and in the new charter (Parliamentary Evidence, 1848) it is proposed to abolish all other charters, *except that of King Henry the Eighth*. We copy a few of these laws sent to the Medical Directory, 1851, by the College of Physicians. "The college is entitled by charter to prevent any one from practising as a physician in London, or within seven miles thereof, who has not submitted to its examination. No fellow or licentiate may consult, in London or within seven miles thereof, with a physician who does not belong to the college, under a penalty of £5. The president and court of the college have the power of committing individuals *contemning their authority to Newgate*; and *this power has been exercised by the Court, but not of late years*." We deny the legality of this as regards members of the Apothecaries' Company, who undergo a more useful and practical examination than that instituted by the College of Physicians; and who are privileged to practise medicine in *any* part of England south of the Tweed. But for the proof of the superiority of the examinations at this college? Dr. James Johnson, Parliamentary Evidence, 1834 (question 3646), said—

"That he underwent three examinations (for the licentiatehip) at the College of Physicians, which did not last altogether *twenty-eight minutes*—that these examinations were *no test at all*.—Sir James Clark (question 3681) said his examination, he thought, lasted *considerably less than half-an-hour*; and that the examination afforded no test of his being well or ill-qualified to practise medicine.—Dr. Neil Arnott (question 2427) stated that his examination was *very limited*. No mention was made of midwifery; and he believed there never was any."

The reader must remember that the licentiates of Pall Mall may meet in consultation, mesmerists, homœopaths, hydropaths, chronothermalists, *et id genus omne*, without fine or censure; but a physician, who may have ten times the talent and practical knowledge of a licentiate of this college, must be avoided as an *incapable*. The reader must also recollect that a man may be a physician without belonging

to one of these clubs; they *did* exist in France, but they were replaced by a *National Faculty of Medicine*, the very basis of which is election by *concours* and public competition. The celebrated physicians and surgeons, anatomists, physiologists, pathologists, pscologists, zoologists, and botanists, whose names adorn the annals of France, prove, beyond dispute, the superiority of the system, and the benefits it has conferred upon medical science, and upon suffering humanity, in all parts of the world. We now take the reader from this, the year of the Great Exhibition, 1851, to that of 1682, when these annals commence.

We first give the number of *socii*, *candidati*, *permissi intra urbem*, and *extra urbem*, which were admitted from 1682 to 1749. The names are all mentioned, and the rejected candidates stated. Some of the disclosures are highly amusing, and would never have been made public by members of the college. They are too politic to foul their own nest.

"*Socii* from 1682 to 1748, admitted 123. *Candidati* (all from Oxford and Cambridge), from 1682 to 1749, 125. *Permissi intra urbem*. From 1682 to 1749—99. *Permissi extra urbem*. From 1682 to 1792, 143." The *candidati* and *permissi* often became *socii*, so that these numbers must be considerably reduced. It must also be borne in mind, that these were the only persons legally qualified to practise medicine in England up to 1815, and that this College, and the College of Surgeons, in 1815, not only refused to examine the general practitioners, but, according to the Parliamentary evidence of Dr. G. Man Burrows, 1834, (question 252), the opposition to the establishment of the Apothecaries' Company was *entirely confined to the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons*. Dr. G. Gregory, in his Introductory Lecture at St. Thomas's Hospital, in October last, says, "So little was medicine thought of in London, that in 1814 the total number of medical pupils attending the seven metropolitau hospitals was only thirty-eight." What a dark and gloomy retrospect is this. We ask the reader to pause awhile and contemplate the effect of these exclusive and unjust laws on the duration of human life, and on human suffering.?

Learning and Erudition.—The annals disclose a great amount of pedantry and ignorance. Bad grammar and spelling are abundant, and such a jumble of dog's-latin—such an attempt to dovetail Latin and English was never seen; e. g. "Dr. Woodard read a lecture on the *bilis*—or any other disease of the *venter*. Mr. Peachey, Dec. 7, 1688, continued spargere chartulas, and his board over his door.—Audit Aug. 1746, *Accepta*, £753 5s. 4d. *Expensa*, £528 2s. *Ballance*, £225 3s. 4d." The last word is always used. In the present Latin Pharmacopœia, 1851, we have *Johannes Churchill, Princes Street, Soho*. "April 6, 1688, Glauber's works in *English* were not approved of by the censors, to be licenced."—"March 18, 1692, College Register kept in English by the advice of the council, because by reason of the variety of stiles in latin, and the uncertain acceptionation of many latin phrases, the Rigister book would not be of any use to the college as a record upon many occasions, as if it were kept in English, and in the plainest words it could be."

"*Statutes, Laws, &c.*—June 26, 1682. *Saneitur ut Sociorium Collegii regalis Medicorum Londinensium necnon Candidatorium, Scociorum, Honorariorum et Permissorum nomina Typis protinus mandentur, Lucrum vero Bedello detur.*" This said beadle was, like all beadles, a very important personage; he delivered the summons, and looked

out for illegal practitioners.—“Sept. 11, 1696, several of the statutes translated into English, and several alterations made in them by the council, and some new statutes added, and were read by Mr. Swift (the attorney), and passed.”—“July 1, 1689, an order of the House of Lords to return the names of such members as are papists, reputed papists, or criminals.” The criminals returned were Drs Grey and Elliot, and their criminality probably consisted in disobeying the laws of the college. A promise to add to the bill by a committee of the House of Lords, that all members of the college should take the sacrament according to the Church of England. This being a surprise to the college unlooked for, the college committee are desired to take all care they can about the affair.—A petition to the law officers of the crown, January 26, 1697, from Drs. J. Clerk, Blackmore, Bernard, Stockham, How, Gibbons, and Pitt, complaining “that the prevailing party of the college had combined together, and in a fraudulent and surreptitious manner made illegal statutes or bye-laws, and annexed rigorous penalties, fines, and amercements, contrary to the charter of Charles II.” The copies of the charters and bye-laws were ordered to be laid before them, but kingly favor and aristocratic influence were always in favor of the college.—October 8, 1697, “The president is ordered to inform himself who is clerk of the lieutenancy, and to give him a catalogue of the names of members of the college, and to present him with a guinea.”—December 16, 1697, an address to William III. from the president, from which we extract the following:—“By a steady and invincible courage you have surmounted such difficulties and performed such actions, as no former age could equal, and posterity could scarce believe. But in a more peculiar manner it becomes this our society, which owes its being to your royal predecessors, and the privileges it enjoys to your Majesty’s favor.”—“Dec. 22, 1701, the president (Sir J. Millington) after much solicitation, by his prudence and winning manner of address to the Earl of Radnor and Mr. Bolter, got the sum of £7,000, owing to the executors of Sir John Cutler, remitted to the sum of £2,000, which he himself, without the knowledge of the college, generously laid down, and afterwards took only this bond of the college for that sum, by *which means he redeemed the college, and gave it a prospect once more of future prosperity.*” The doctor, it is said, should live in the annals of the college to all future generations.”—“Dec. 22, 1703, The præses natus, with six other electors, withdrew into the censors’ room to chuse a new president instead of Sir J. Millington, deceased, for the rest of the year.” “Dr. Collins’s book in latin subscribed for by several. A physician to Christ’s Hospital chosen.”—“Feb. 25, 1701, a petition to Parliament by the graduates of Oxford, that they might be admitted to the college without examination by the censors.” This, of course, was opposed.—“In 1702 a paper of grievances was sent in by thirteen members of the college, complaining that their unjust laws kept many worthy practisers of physick from the college, whereby our debts increase, without prospect of remedy, and our body diminishes, without hopes of repair, &c.” The petitioners also complain that not only the fellows but the censors themselves are denied the view of the statutes and register.”—The proposal mentioned in the foregoing paper of grievances, requiring that the president should hereafter be obliged to propose any matter whatsoever to the college, if requested so to do, by any ten of the fellows,

being debated, was rejected by all but one.”—“March 10, 1700, all members of the college were desired to be present at the trial (at the bar of the House of Lords) of Rose, the apothecary, for practicing physic, and in the meantime to *solicit* with the lords they knew on behalf of the college, and solicit them to be there.” *These are the words in the letter addressed to each.* The Lords, however (contrary to the expectations of the bystanders), reversed the judgment of the Court of Queen’s Bench, thus ruling that an apothecary in 1700 was legally qualified to practice physic; in other words, as at present, to act as a physician.—“April 7, 1707. All statutes, except those contained in the old book in Latin, to be abrogated.”—“March, 1708. That the library shall be free to all members of the college. That no candles be brought into the library, or any to have liberty of *smoking tobacco there.*”—“Dr. Chrichton (1700) refused to pay his dues as ‘licentiate,’ because he did not think the statutes good, because the licentiates were not concerned in the making them, and therefore he was not obliged to pay. The president told him that no licentiate *ever was, or ever ought to be, present, or to have a voice in the making of any statute.*” A month was given to Dr. Chrichton to consider of the matter, and give his final answer.—“Dr. Flemming (1710) also refused to pay his quarterly dues, unless he were admitted to the board of the fellows, to make statutes.—May 7, 1711, Mr. Swift ordered to draw up an instrument to oblige all the college members, under a penalty, not to consult with any persons not of the college.—The penalty here named is £40. 1711, The library being supervised, was opened to the members.” It is *now* closed to them.—October 1, 1711, “Ordered that all licentiates, previous to their admission, give a bond of £50 before their admission, to pay the quarterly dues to the college.—The president gave the college the choice of 2s. 6d., or two pair of gloves, for Dr. Hamey’s gift.” They took the gloves.—June 12, 1713, Statuimus et ordinamus quod nullus in posterum licentiatatus sive permissus ad praxim medicinæ in hac urbe admittatur, nisi prius septuaginta libras legalis monetæ Magnæ Britanniæ Thesaurario hujus Collegii pro tempore existento, in usum ejusdem solverit et quascunque alias sumas p. statuta Collegii tempore permissionis debitas, vol ii., p. 24.—“The president Aug. 20, 1713, communicated to the board that the regular doctors of Norfolk and Suffolk were endeavouring to get an Act of Parliament for the better regulating physic.”—“A circular was again sent to the bishops, desiring them not to licence without testimonial letters from the president and the elects. A catalogue of members to be sent to each vestry, but the abode of the members to be omitted.—Feb. 19, 1713, Ordered, that practice be taken against all illegal practisers of physic.—Jan. 13, 1715, Ordered, a guinea to be given to Mr. Hamlin, Mr. Jodorels, chief under clerk in Parliament, to give us notice of anything passing in the House of Commons relating to the College of Physicians.—Dec. 4, 1719, The college kitchen to be made ready for entertainments in the college.—1720, The registrar drew up a form for subscribing towards the college repairs, &c.—Mr. Knaplock gave £200 for printing the College Dispensatory, a royal license to be obtained to prevent translation. The dispensatory, as before, to be inscribed to the King (Charles II.)—April, 1721, Dr. Bainbridge (who had often been summoned in Latin) for contempt, to be discommuned, and all penalties for non-attendance to be strictly exacted.—A complaint

against the beadle, for not summoning an old woman for malapraaxis, who said she valued not any physician in London; God had given her a gift, and she ought to make use of it.—Dec. 22, 1721, A letter to the universities, telling them to be cautious in admitting Doctors of Physic.—Feb. 22, 1721, Mr. Dover was summoned for neglecting a moral statue. The immorality consisted in refusing to meet a Dr. Wagstaff, whose patient he directed to be bled to 40 oz. It was decided that he had transgressed the *moral* statutes, but he was admonished, not fined.—Fee morality appears to have been the *cardinal* virtue.—“April 8, 1723, Only two licentiates present: penalties to be levied on the absentees.—July 5, 1723, Mr. Mead ordered to seize the effects of the college tenant, Stokes, for payment of arrears.—August 4, 1723, Resolved, that licentiates for the future shall have the liberty of compounding for their annual payments for ever, at the time of their admission.—April 10, 1724, a committee for promoting the bill now depending in Parliament. Thanks given to the president and others, *for speaking to the bill before the House of Lords*. Dr. Eaton obtained permission for the exemption of his Styptic from the view, search, &c., of the censors.” *Thus a direct encouragement was given by the college to quackery.* (vol. ii., p. 28.) “The Lord Chancellor (Macclesfield) thanked for inserting two clauses in the bill for making the judgment of the college for fine and imprisonment *final*.—Dec. 22, 1725, That the statute relating to honorary fellows be repealed.—June 7, 1728, That no member of the college shall meet the Rev. Mr. Johnson, who practises physie about London.—April 3, 1732, Forty guineas to be given to Mr. Mead, for soliciting the bill.—Sept. 30, 1736, The usual present of 60 oz. of plate to the president, not being finished by the workmen, could not be presented on this day as had been customary.—April 12, 1742, Dr. Sarmento to be expelled the college if he did not pay his quarterage.—June 25, 1741, the president proposed that for the future M.D.’s of Oxford and Cambridge, who were licentiates, should be excused the trouble of visiting the fellows, and should be admitted without examination or further payment.—March 29, 1708, Stokes, the college tenant at Ashlyne, to keep no dogs, nets, nor other engines for destroying game. No game to be destroyed on the said manor save for the use of the president.”

Bequests, donations, and subscriptions.—It must be borne in mind that this college, up to the present time, has *only been supported by the subscriptions and donations of its fellows*; but as they have derived a *direct* pecuniary advantage from the medico-apothecary system, the money, on their part, has been profitably spent. Dr. Baldwin Hamley, May, 1672, gave his estate to the college, on condition that two fellows of the college should be nominated to fill all vacancies that occurred at the three royal hospitals. That the orator should have £5, and the president, elects, and fellows, who were present, one pair of gloves each (there were no *censors*, we suppose, at this time). But here comes the remarkable gift:—“The president of the said college, from the time being, shall successively be presented with a piece of silver plate, of above threescore ounces, by the treasurer.” It will be our business, as public journalists, hereafter to enquire how far these bequests have been complied with, and whether as, in the case of the recent Swiney Cup. adjudication to Dr. Paris by the office-bearers of

the college, Drs. Nairne, Monro, and F. Hawkins, there may not have been an irregularity that may *invalidate* the whole proceeding?

Imprisonment, fine, persecution, &c.—No Chinese mandarin or eastern despot ever exercised more tyrannical power than the president and censors of this college have done. Doctors of medicine, apothecaries, chirurgeons, (“*Betsy Gamps and Sairey Harris’s*,”)—the learned and the unlearned, were all summoned before this medical inquisition. Dr. Groenvelt (1694), a *licentiate* of the college, was accused before the censors by ignorant women of giving cantharides, to the injury of the patient, whose ease was investigated. The doctor, these minutes say, “behaved himself with great confidence, said he had cured many that had been in the fellows’ hands, and threatened to write a book against them.” The censors made out their warrant, and committed him to Newgate. A Habeas Corpus was moved for, and he was discharged, the Attorney-General ruling that his crime was within pardon of the King; the judges also agreeing that the college might impose a fine, and imprison until the fine was paid. The doctor brought an action against the censors, but soon after paid two shillings for being absent last college day, promised obedience, petitioned for a charitable gift to him in prison, and it was left to every man to give as he pleased.”—Mr. Peachy (1689), refused to pay the £4 he was fined, whereupon he was fined £8 for his second contempt. Dr. Peachy refused, the trial came on at Guildhall (July 20, 1692), and the college was nonsuited, because the book of statutes, ordinarily so reputed, was not *dated*. The Lord Chief Justice advised that the college statutes should be confirmed anew.”—Dr. Radcliffe, for absenting himself from the college 26 times, being legally summoned, and for his contemptuous slight of the college comitia, was expelled, and declared non socius;—whosoever henceforth consulted with him, it should be *sub pœnâ decem librarum*.” Vide comit. extraord.—Dr. Baynard being summoned, came to the censors’ board, April 7, 1693, left the following letter:—“Mr. President, I am a gentleman, and no footman; so do not understand waiting beyond the time of your summons. If you or the censors have any further business with me, you must send a further summons, and be more punctual to your time than in this, otherwise I shall not obey it. I am, as you please, your’s, or not your servant—EDWARD BAYNARD.” We insert this letter, as showing an extraordinary instance of independence in these days of sycophaney and servility.—“Dr. Nicholson, 1693, the senior candidate, desired to be admitted a fellow, but was refused, because he had not visited the fellows. Dr. Cole appeared, (March, 1694), and acknowledging that he read an anatomical lecture in Surgeon’s Hall, without leave from the president, the censors declared him guilty of breaking the statute *de anatomica administratione*, and fined him accordingly.”—The college game was to keep all in greater ignorance than themselves. “May 8, 1694. An advertisement ordered to be inserted in the ‘Gazette,’ that complaints having been made to the censors’ board against illegal and ignorant practisers in London, and seven miles’ compass, all persons, or their friends so aggrieved, might apply to the censors the first Friday in every month, in order for the punishment of such offenders.”—“April 7, 1707, Joseph Thompson, ordered to be arrested at the suit of the college.”—“Oct. 8, 1707, Mary Clark, in Bunhill-fields, next door to the ‘Sun,’

came to complain of Elizabeth Pratt, in Blue Anchor-alley, that she gave her physick from the middle of July to the beginning of October, for obstructions, particularly vomits, and says she is an ill woman."—"Elizabeth Pratt ordered to be summoned for next Friday. The case was heard, and the censors were unanimously of opinion that Elizabeth Pratt was guilty of mala praxis in not well using the Faculty of Physic, but deferred the punishment to another time. On the 23rd of February the censors' warrant was made out, and Elizabeth Pratt was committed to Newgate for 12 weeks. She sent, however, a humble petition to the president, and was released after four weeks' incarceration."—"Sept. 11, 1711. Christopher Barker committed to Newgate for 12 weeks, for endeavouring to salivate Thomas Gillet, although the prisoner did not appear before the censors." The consors' warrant to discharge him may be seen, fol. 275, former register.—"Jan 3, 1712. Mr. Barker, nephew of the above C. Barker, acknowledging his contempt and ignorance of the laws, in depending upon the license from the bishop, praying to be discharged from his imprisonment, and that his fine may be remitted. The consideration of this petition was deferred by the censors."—"Nov. 1713, Dr. West having been arrested for illicita praxis, came to the censors' board, and demanded to be admitted according to the statute of Henry VIII. The president *was ready to give him leave to visit, in order to examination*, and to be admitted as others had been. Dr. West resisted, and a subscription was entered into by the members to defray the charges of the suit against him."—1698, John Hobbs, an apothecary, was complained against by Mrs. Powell, for mala praxis, but did not appear at the censors' board. The said Hobbs was disincomuned, and the members of the college forbid to send their bills to him on pain of penalty."—"April 12, 1712, Mr. Hunt, the apothecary, prayed that the prosecution by the former censors might be taken off; his submission was accepted, on paying the charges."—"Mr. Butler to be summoned in latin. Mr. Butler appeared, and behaved himself too pertly; he was told that he could not practice without a license."—"June 5, 1730, Ageron Fabricius to be summoned, but he went beyond the seas, and put himself under the protection of the foreign ambassador." These are a few only of the cases.

Examinations and Rejections during these 67 years. Kings' physicians found a ready ingress provided they would pay the money. "In 1717 the Duke of Montague was proposed, balloted for, and elected fellow, having been admitted Doctor of Physic of Cambridge when King George was there. The fellows resolved to go in their gowns, and admit him *at his own house*. In 1728 the Duke of Richmond was desirous of being admitted a fellow. He was balloted for, and elected at his own house, like the Duke of Montague. Dr. A. Stewart, in 1728, was admitted a member and fellow (as Queen's physician) without examination; and several others enjoyed the same privilege. In 1687 Dr. Clench was restored to his fellowship on his petition and submission, and upon the Lord Chancellor's *request*."

Candidates.—"Dr. H. Chamberlen was admitted 1689; but admonished to apply himself more diligently to the therapeutic part of physic.—Dr. Adams, 1694, refused to have his diploma written upon the parchment stamp; but the president thought the hazard of the £500 penalty would be too great.—Dr. Joseph Brown, 1697, gave no satisfaction, neither

to the president nor censors, and therefore was rejected.—Dr. Hannes passed his examination 1697; but not coming to be admitted for a year, all the members of the college were forbidden to consult with him.” The candidates had usually been *created* Doctors of Physic of Cambridge or Oxford, and *generally* not examined by the College of Physicians.

Permissi intra urbem.—“Mr. Twill, 1688, brought his admission from the Apothecaries. He was admitted, but told he would be expelled if he sold or dispensed physic to *any other patients than his own*.—Mr. Turberville was admitted 1684, but in the opinion of the censors was very indifferently qualified; but he promised *to go into Wales for some years before he practised in London*.—Dr. Eaton, 1713, was advised to pursue his studies sometime longer.—Dr. E. Brown, 1721, was admonished by the president to behave himself towards the Faculty with respect and without reflections. He was admitted.—Dr. Thomas Butler, 1722, examined in physiology. Upon consideration of the favor granted him to be examined in English, the censors put to him a chapter in Galen in Latin, *de usu partium*, which by statute he ought to have read, but could not construe it, then proceeded in an English examination. Upon the whole the censors could not approve of him; and the president acquainted him therewith, and forbid him practise according to statute.—Mr. Bamber, 1724, was admitted, but disfranchised from the Barber Surgeons’ Company.”

Permissi extra urbem.—“George Lamb, Esq., of St. John’s College, Cambridge, 1709, “answered extraordinarily well,” and obtained letters testimonial from the *elects*.—Mr. Buck was not approved.—Dr. Bayley, 1720, gave great satisfaction; and his licence was sealed by the president and three elects.—Mr. Owen, 1720, was examined in English, and told to appear again when he felt himself stronger.”—Messrs. Johnson, Bushby, and Green, 1723, 1724, 1734, shared the same fate. The expression, “bred an apothecary,” is constantly used in describing the men of this grade. The above are the only rejections we find during this period of 67 years.

Sept. 30, 1697. “In the balloting of Dr. Goodall (for censor) *there were two balls more than there were fellows*, and those in the negative. The president, abhorring the baseness of such an action, ordered the beadle to deliver to every fellow one ball only;” *then* Dr. Goodall had the majority of votes, and was elected.”—Dr. Henderson, Parliamentary Evidence, 1834, question 3317, stated that Dr. Mason Good told him that, after his rejection *by ballot* by the examiners, 3 out of his 5 examiners called upon him and expressed their regret and *astonishment* at the event.—Comitia Censoria, Dec. 6, 1689, “Mrs. Wolveston came to have our hands to her being a licentiate in midwifery. She was examined, and modestly and prudently answered to satisfaction.—John Davies, servant and son to R. Davies, an apothecary, was examined and approved.—Dec. 18, 1696, Mr. Gery, an apothecary, refused a certificate to recommend him to Greenwich Hospital because he did not come to be examined when he first opened shop.—April 3, 1699. Dr. Hanns having been examined a year since for candidate, and having *leave given* to visit the fellows, which he did not, nor took any notice of it, but continued to practise still in London, the president forbid all the members of the College to consult with him upon penalty of the statutes.”—Dr. Tomlinson appeared and alledged that “he had been examined and approved by the president and censors,

but that he was not admitted for some reasons unknown to him. The censors' book was called for, and it was recorded *there* that he had been examined but not approved."—Nov. 1, 1700, That Doctor West, a Doctor of Physic of Oxford, to be prosecuted at law for practising physic in London.—Dr. Levet (Dec. 20, 1701) promised to appear at the censors' board to be examined; but would not promise, as they wished, in the name of a gentleman, not to practice in that time, telling them that if they took him practicing he would pay the penalty.—Sept. 21, 1708, Dr. Slare was called in, and being before chosen an elect, was examined. The president asked him "*Cujus es?*" He answered "*Angus, ex agro Northamptoniensis.*" He was examined by the rest of the elects present, and gave his faith to the college.—Nov. 3, 1721, Dr. Brown offered to pay £25. down for his diploma, and the rest in two years. He was balloted for, and admitted a licentiate, having agreed to pay the balance in one year.—Dec. 1, 1721, Mr. Thomas Butler desired to be examined in English for the licentiateship. His request was granted; but he was rejected, and interdicted from practice. The president, in relation to this examination, stated two instances of examinations (*intra urbem*) in English. It was decided that none for the future should be examined but in Latin, *without the consent of the college*.—Dr. Butler again examined, and a chapter in Galen put to him, which by statute he ought to have read. He was forbidden to practice.—March 2, 1722, Dr. Hulse being absent at the censors' meeting examined Dr. Bainbrigge, M.D., D. Cant. and Samuda, at his own house, and reported his approbation. Dr. B. had been repeatedly summoned and discommuned. The discommuning revoked. Oct. 19, 1724, "Dr. Campbell examined as an honorary fellow, as proposed by the president; also Drs. Massey and Middleton."—March 2, 1730, Mr. Young visited, in order to be examined as a licentiate in English. *It was taken notice of* that he had been bred a surgeon. He was advised by the president and censors to be examined as an extra licentiate.—Dr. Schomberg, M.D., Cantab, Dec. 1, 1749, called in and questioned. The president asked the three censors whether the Dr. had given proper satisfaction? The censors were not unanimous, and nothing was resolved; but the majority thought he had made proper satisfaction (vol. 3, p. 14). Dec. 22, Moved and carried that the resolution respecting Dr. Schomberg be recalled. Feb. 2, 1750, Dr. Schomberg examined in physiology, in pathology, was approved, and told to come next censors' day. Two of the censors out of the three declared him qualified; but Dr. Battie did not think him, upon the whole, "*Idoneus qui admittatur in numerum candidatorum.*" Dr. Battie appears to have spited him from the beginning. "The sense of the college was taken by ballot; 15 balls were against the Dr., and 2 in his favor."

Bishops.—In 1687 a letter was sent to all the bishops not to licence any practisers of physic without the college recommendation, in which are these words, "We thought it our duty to inform your lordship than in a statute made 14th & 15th H. VIII., c. v., the power of examining such persons as take upon them to practice physic was given by the statute of the 3rd of H. VIII., c. 11, to the bishops in their respective dioceses, or, in case of their absence, to their vicars-general, is transferred to the president and 3 elects of the College of Physicians, who are to examine the said persons at London, and to

give them letters-testimonial of their approving and examination of them before they can by the bishops or their vicars-general to the practice of physic, &c." At the present time, 1851, there are 8 or 10 "*divine*" doctors; that is, created by bishops! and a man who buys a foreign degree of a London wine merchant, for £40., may be admitted to examination at the College of Physicians!

But the reader will naturally ask what are the *present* laws of this College? The annals will tell him that they gradually became more tyrannical and arbitrary, and the President and Censors say in the "London Medical Directory," for the *present* year, that they have the power of committing individuals *contemning their authority* to Newgate. Lord Mansfield (1767, *R. v. Askew*) spoke of the *illegal* bye-law which restrained the number of fellows to 20, and "he considered the words *socii, communitas, collegium, societas, or collega.* as synonymous terms." But let us give an example now before us, of the effect of this Charter of 1519 upon our medical institutions, and of the baneful influence of corporate power, upon hospital appointments.

We have stated before that nearly all the London hospital appointments are obtained *indirectly* by *purchase*. Mr. South, in his recent Oration at St. Thomas's Hospital, said, that "no instance had occurred in the history of the hospital of the election of a surgeon who had not *been an apprentice.*" In 1843 an hospital was commenced at Paddington (St. Mary's). It was understood, at the formation of this institution, that one especial feature in its management would be the election of the medical officers by *concours*, or public competition; and, according to the laws, 1849 (page 59), it is said:—

"The weekly board shall refer all the candidates legally qualified for the office, and of whose respectability of character they are satisfied, to an examining board, and such board of examiners shall consist of not less than five, and not more than nine, competent persons, to be chosen by the Medical Committee, subject to the approval of the weekly board. The examination shall be open to the attendance of the Governors of the Hospital, and shall consist—1, of written replies to questions in writing; 2, of *viva-voce* examinations; 3, of clinical demonstrations; 4, of demonstrations on the dead body; and 5, (in the case of an examination for the office of a Surgeon or Assistant-Surgeon,) of surgical operations on the subject.

"The board of examiners shall select, after due examination, the three best qualified competitors, if there be five or more, or the two best, if there be less than five, and the names of the selected candidates shall be sent back to the weekly board on separate cards, without comments, unless under circumstances of distinguished merit, when it shall be competent for the examining board, with the consent of a majority of not less than four-fifths of its members, to report specially thereon. In case there should be only one or two candidates, the examining board shall report the result of their examination of such candidate or candidates."

On the 5th of July, 1850, a special committee was formed for the election of medical officers, and it was recommended to the weekly Board to adopt the following plan:—

"That a Special Committee, to consist of nine non-medical Governors, be appointed to recommend to the weekly board, for election by the open votes of all the Governors, persons to fill the offices of the three senior-physicians, the three senior-surgeons, the physician-accoucheur, the surgeon-accoucheur, the ophthalmic and the aural surgeons."

After this the special committee was to advertise for assistant-physicians and assistant-surgeons, to examine testimonials, and to recommend to the weekly Board the persons they thought best qualified. The physicians *selected* and *elected* were Drs. Alderson, Chambers, and Sibson; the surgeons, Messrs. Coulson, Lane, and Ure. Then came the

selection of the names of assistant-physicians, and those recommended were Drs. Markham, Sieveking, Jones, and Miller. The medical staff committee added the name of Dr. Lankester, but the special committee left out his name on the ground of his non-qualification, and the committee were supported by the Board, the numbers being 36 to 21. Dr. Miller retired from the contest, and the three assistant-physicians, as there was no contest, walked over the course—one of them we saw (May 9th) vote for *himself*; he held up his hand against the addition of other candidates to the list; an exclusion which, of course, made him a physician to the hospital. *So ends election by concours at St. Mary's!* But not so our illustration. A Mr. Heale, a licentiate of the College of Physicians, has thought proper to enlighten the governors, (whose suffrages he *would* have solicited,) with a letter, of which the following choice MORCEAU is a specimen:—

“A most outrageous insult has been offered to the medical profession, and to the governors at large, by the recommendation of a gentleman to fill the office of assistant physician, who possesses no legal qualification whatever, but who at this moment is under sentence of unfitness from the only body authorized to license physicians to practise in London,—viz.: the Royal College of Physicians,—and who is guilty of the disrespect of our Sovereign of claiming the rank of M.D. on the strength of a worthless German degree, in opposition to and contempt of Her authority, from whom alone all honour in England properly emanates.”

We are neither acquainted with Dr. Lankester nor with Dr. Heale, but we have *always* been advocates for election by *concours* and the substitution of *national* institutions for *private* clubs. Dr. Lankester is an extra-licentiate of the College of Physicians—that is, *he may practise* (according to the College edicts) *at Richmond, but not in St. Giles's*; he is also an M.D. of Heidelberg by residence and examination, a Member of the College of Surgeons, and a Licentiate of the Apothecaries' Company; late Senior Physician to the Farringdon Dispensary, and a Lecturer on Materia Medica at the St. George's School of Medicine; the author of several medical works, and he obtained honours in ten of the classes of University College. In 1847 he presented himself for examination for the London Licence of the College of Physicians, and was rejected (we quote from his published account of the transaction). One of his examiners, six years before, had given him a certificate stating “that he would fill the office of physician to a Dispensary with credit to himself and much advantage to the objects of the institution.” Another of his examiners was a lecturer at a rival school. It will be observed that Dr. Lankester's diploma from the Apothecaries' Company gives him a *legal right* to practise medicine in London. An *illegal* practitioner who *buys* his diploma at the College of Physicians of Edinburgh is eligible! Although comparisons are odious, we express our belief that Dr. Lankester is superior to the three assistant-physicians who have obtained the appointment. It is corporate influence that has effected all this; and, as we stated in our first number, it never showed its brazen front with such unblushing impudence as at present. The reader, with a particle of common sense, must see the connexion of the “Annals” with this *job* at St. Mary's. The general practitioner must be dull indeed, if he does not comprehend its bearing, upon *his* future position.

In our next we give the histories of the College of Surgeons, and the Apothecaries' Company.

The Histories of the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons, and of the Apothecaries' Company (continued).

'Tis a matter of life and death, Lawrentio ;
A stage, where men have played strange parts,
Brought grades and fashions to the sick man's couch,
And made a map of science to suit their *pockets*!—OLD PLAY.

Our picture of the College of Physicians would not be complete if we did not add a few modern tints, and place some of the present actors in the foreground. The reader is especially requested to keep his eye on the dark shadows of the picture. The regal forms of Henry VIII., James I., and Charles II.,—the ballot-box—the metropolitan line—the iniquitous bye-laws—making this college a *club*, and not a *national* institution;—a corporation that has been kept in existence only by the private subscriptions of its fellows.

Wilcock,* in his *Laws of the Medical Profession*, 1830, pp. 36, says, “ This college is, to a certain extent, a private body. It was instituted in a reign during which patents of monopoly and exclusive privileges were daily granted, and more frequently for the purpose of replenishing the exchequer, and *enriching individuals by the profits of the monopoly, than in consideration of the public welfare.*” It must be recollected that the simile made by Dr. J. A. Wilson, in his Parliamentary evidence, between “ this college and the neighbouring clubs,” is scarcely applicable, for at the neighbouring clubs a man is balloted for *once*, at the College of Physicians twice; first by the censors, and secondly by the fellows. Dr. Hastings, of Albemarle Street, in 1846, was elected by ballot by the censors, and afterwards rejected (by ballot) by the fellows. The doctor, however, called a meeting of the college, and the third ballot made him a licentiate. These were not the laws made 330 years ago, but the edicts of a *clique*, whose exclusive acts, and illegal proceedings, appear to have increased with the dawn of science, and the spread of knowledge.

Harvey, and Drs. Bonham, Wells, Burgess, Wright, Stanger, and others, were badly treated by this college. Sydenham was denied the fellowship. Drs. Armstrong and Mason Good were rejected, and Jenner was refused their licence. The Dukes of Richmond and Montague were made fellows at their own houses, the fellows going in procession in their gowns! Jenner told them that at his time of life, to set about brushing up Greek and Latin, would be irksome in the extreme; but, said he, “ I wish you would frame a bye-law for admitting men among you who would communicate new discoveries for the improvement of the practice of physic. On this score (not alluding to vaccination) I could face your inquisition with some degree of firmness.”—*Baron's Life of Jenner.*

In the first volume of the *Examiner* (p. 123) we have inserted the names of nearly 200 distinguished members of our profession; and it will be

* We are indebted to this writer, and to Kennedy, on Medical Monopolies, for some of the information in this article.

seen that those whose names are in italics were in general practice, and were by far the most celebrated. In the Appendix, page 39, the Oxford and Cambridge graduates, practising in London, are contrasted with those physicians who have taken degrees elsewhere. The reader, on perusing the names, will, we believe, think with us, that the comparison is greatly in favor of the latter, although the Oxford, Cambridge, or Dublin graduates, have invariably been elected as censors and examiners for the London licentiates. The subject is too important to allow us to avoid the comparison, although it may be odious to many; if we were a member of the College of Physicians we might be fined for a breach of a *moral* statute!

For further information respecting the prosecutions of the College of Physicians we refer the reader to the Annals, and to Wilcock's Laws of the Medical Profession, 1830, where the trials of Goddard, Archer, Letch, Askew, Fothergill, Stanger, Schomberg, Levett, West, Bonham, Rose, Gardner, Tenant, Butler, Basset, Bush, Talbois, Sahnnon, Huybert, Needham, and others, are given. But the last, and most important trial, took place in 1828. Dr. Edward Harrison, a graduate of the University of Edinburgh, where he had passed a better examination than that instituted by the College of Physicians, was practising within the sacred circle as a physician. He was written to by the censors, who told him that they acted under their charter, Henry VIII., confirmed by Parliament. The doctor, in his reply, said, "that the title of censors was not mentioned in the charter, nor was anything said about the examination of graduates of universities, nor of fellows and licentiates;—that the boast of the college was a mere *brutum fulmen*!" Dr. Harrison also spoke of the duty he owed to his Alma Mater, and "pledged himself to defend the action on *public* grounds, and for the advantage of our common profession." The doctor's magniloquence, however, vanished at the trial; and persuaded, we suppose, by his lawyers, he deserted the main question, for it was pleaded that he practised as a surgeon in the case of Miss A., who had a spinal affection; and by this means he obtained a verdict in his favor. If Dr. Harrison had advocated his own cause, and laid bare this iniquitous medico-apothecary system of club-laws and boundaries, he might have lost his action; but he would have hastened the establishment of a representative Faculty of Medicine, and he would have stood better in the estimation of his brethren. Dr. Harrison had no legal right to practise medicine in England. If he had been a member of the Apothecaries' Company, the College would not have dared to have brought the action. It came out on this trial that Drs. Baillie, Warren, Paris, and Turner, had met Dr. Harrison in consultation, and that *three* of them had been called upon to pay the penalty imposed by this bye-law (Wilcock, p. cxxx.) We are unable to state how the expense of the prosecution was paid; but probably, as on former occasions, by a subscription of the fellows.

Complaints among the licentiates of this college, and the physicians unconnected with it, have been numerous; but such is the power of aristocratic influence and club-law in England, that the men who have taken a leading part in medical reform have always suffered both in pocket and position. Our legislators, moreover, who have generally

been connected directly or indirectly with the so-called aristocracy of the country, have treated the *most important matter* that could come before them—one of life and death—almost with indifference. *They* could obtain what *they* considered good medical attendance; and might have the consolation, before their dust was mingled with the peasants', of having their pulses felt by a fashionable attendant within the sacred circle.

In 1832 a long petition, signed by British physicians, was presented to the House of Commons by Mr. Hume. The petitioners complained of the illegal acts of the College of Physicians, and they were *innocent* enough to hazard this conclusion:—"It would *greatly distress* your Honourable House to add to this statement *the probable amount of lives prematurely destroyed, and the aggregate mass of affliction which, during these 300 years, have proceeded from the culpable inactivity and carelessness of this college.*"

In 1833 another petition was presented by 50 licentiates of the College of Physicians practising in London. Among the names are those of Drs. Marshall Hall, Forbes, Locock, Copland, Holland, Gregory, Southwood Smith, J. Webster, R. Lee, C. J. B. Williams, Neil Arnott, Henry Clutterbuck, and James Clark. The three last-mentioned gentlemen, *true to their principles* (to their honor be it spoken), refused the fellowship when offered to them. All the rest took it; and, we believe, with one exception (Dr. Hall), have not opened their mouths since to cry Medical Reform. Godfrey's cordial never quieted a crying baby with more certainty, nor chloroform subdued a restless spirit more effectually, than the fellowship-sop did these *quondam* reformers. The petitioners complained "That bye-laws had been framed which are directly opposed to, and in violation of, the letter and meaning of the Charter, which spoke of the College as a Faculty or Commonalty. That the founders all studied at, and obtained degrees at, Foreign Universities: and that no distinction is mentioned as regards the university where a physician may have obtained his degree. That the fellows have usurped all corporate power. That the term licentiate (by implication) is a degradation; and that *all* are entitled to the fellowship. That the licentiates are not even admitted to the Library or Museum of the College. That the College demand, and take a large sum of money, for the privilege of practising as physicians within a circuit of seven miles of London; and that they do not, and *cannot, protect them in this privilege.* That Dissenters are excluded from the fellowship; and that these invidious bye-laws have produced continued litigation, and created a jealousy between the fellows and licentiates, discreditable to the members of a liberal profession."

We now bring the history of the College of Physicians to a climax, by quoting some of the Parliamentary evidence in 1847; evidence by which our aristocratic legislators are to be guided in the construction of the forthcoming Medical Bill. We dare not trust ourselves to comment on this report; but we direct the reader's attention to those parts of it that we have placed in italics. The examination referred to the Medical Registration Bill then before the House of Commons.

introduced by Mr. Wakley and Mr. Warburton. But *all* the evidence should be seen.

Dr. Paris, President of the College of Physicians. Question 55. Have any complaints come within your knowledge, or have they been preferred to you, or are you cognizant of any complaint, of any abuse of power or authority, as exercised by the college?—No.—56. No complaints have been addressed to the college of abuse of their power and authority?—No; *I am not aware of any*—57. Are you aware, whether to Parliament, or to other constituted authorities, any representations have been made of the abuse of your power?—I believe there have; in the various attempts made to obtain reform, I have no doubt that statements against our college have found their way into various petitions.—33. When you say that the knowledge of languages is tested, is it in more than one dead language that the parties are examined?—Latin and *Greek*.—269. You say that you think the profession ought to be registered in grades?—Yes.—38. Besides examining, have you any other power over physicians practising in London, and within a circle of seven miles?—Yes, we have a *moral* power; if any licentiates or fellows conduct themselves in a way which *we consider unprofessional we summon, censure, and fine them*; and we consider that that is quite sufficient. We do not want any further power as to punishment.—231. Have you any fellows of the college who practise mesmerism at this time?—I believe there are some.—232. Is it not notorious that such is the case?—Yes, it is notorious that one fellow of the college does practise mesmerism.—233. Has he received any censure from the college?—No.—Since he has so publicly practised mesmerism has he been permitted to deliver a public oration in the college?—He has.—235. He was selected voluntarily for the performance of that duty, was he not?—Perhaps I may be allowed to explain the circumstances under which he was appointed. *The appointment rests with the president*; and the rule is, that each fellow in succession should have it offered to him. When it came to the turn of this gentleman, finding that no public notice had been taken of this by the college, but that he was, so far as the college was concerned, *rectus in curia*, I felt it to be my duty, as president, not to pass him over, and *I therefore appointed him*.—290. But, in point of fact, the powers of the college at law are so weak and so paralyzed that they have not thought it their duty to attempt to punish parties who have entered into such compacts, although you deem those compacts in the highest degree injurious to the character of the profession?—I do not consider the law weak; the law is strong; but *we have not the means of carrying it into effect*.—291. You mean you have not money?—*We have not money*.—128. Will you be kind enough to explain on what principle you think that the distinction can be defended which is made between persons practising within seven miles of London and persons practising throughout the rest of the country; and why a different rule should be imposed upon the man who practises at Chelsea and the man who practises at Norwich?—Such is the present law.—129. But does it appear to you to be a reasonable state of the law?—Yes, I think it is; I think *that a higher order of physicians should be secured for the metropolis*; that has *always worked very well*, and it has preserved very much the *dignity of the profession*. In many parts of the country it is hardly to be expected that persons can be educated to the same extent that they are for metropolitan practice; you would not be able to secure the class of physicians for the remote provinces, suppose you equalized the character of their education; but, however, *the fact is now that the same examination takes place for extra licentiates (as they are called) as for licentiates*.—130. Do not you conceive that the superiority and dignity of the profession in the metropolis is sufficiently explained, and would be always secured by the circumstance that the greater prizes for eminent men must always be there; is it not rather the greatness of the prizes which talent and learning obtain in the metropolis than any rule respecting a circle of seven miles, which has caused the London circle to draw to it the most eminent medical men in the kingdom?—I think not.

203. A gentleman (Dr. Lankester) who had obtained an extra licence to practise beyond seven miles of London, having applied for a licence to give him a right to practise within seven miles of London, was examined and rejected by the censors?—Yes.—204. Was that gentleman a lecturer in one of the schools in London?—That I am not aware of.—205. Do you know whether he was examined by a lecturer in a neighbouring school in the metropolis?—Very likely; I really cannot charge my memory with the data at present.—206. Does one black ball, after the examination

has taken place, have the effect of rejecting the candidate?—No.—207. How many black balls must there be?—At the board there would be five, the president and the four censors; and there must be a majority in order to exclude the party.—208. How long has the question been decided by a majority?—As long as I remember; I was a censor 30 years ago, and it was decided by a majority then.—209. Do they decide openly and in writing, or do they decide by putting balls into a box?—There is a ballot, but there is no secret about the voting.—210. It is decided by ballot?—Yes; every gentleman puts in a ball.—211. And in the absence of the candidate?—Yes.

308. Would you not infer from that, that the public do not want them (physicians)?—No; I speak from my own knowledge. A general practitioner this morning told me that if this Bill passed he should withdraw his son from Oxford; and he is a leading member of the body calling itself the National Institute of Medicine; he said that it was not his intention to bring his son forward as a physician if the Bill passed; that he considered that the character of the physician would be entirely lost.—309.—Did he explain how the public would sustain any loss from that circumstance?—No.—132. May I ask what the functions of the general practitioner are exactly; does he not unite the functions of physician, surgeon, and apothecary?—He practises in medical cases, and, to a certain degree, in surgical cases.—133. He does then, in fact, all that the physician does and all that the surgeon does, but in a way generally not quite equal to the way in which the physician or the surgeon would do it; is that your opinion?—Yes; he treats medical and surgical cases to a certain extent.

159. Not being prepared to admit, having, on the contrary, every reason to deny, that the Royal College of Physicians has abused its powers, you contend that those powers ought not to be abridged?—Certainly.

Dr. G. Burrows said the charter bound the College of Physicians to exercise great moral control over its members—that the neighbouring practitioners might club together to ruin a man (385, 387)—he thought the licentiates had made complaints (761)—that a general practitioner does not perform the duties of a physician (779)—he has not such complicated cases to deal with (823)—he is expected to practise his profession, the physician to teach (816)—so strict a knowledge of pathology not necessary to the general practitioner (822)—the majority of those who enter the profession enter the lower grade; they are generally persons of humble means; and they just get as much medical knowledge as will enable them to fill certain public situations, such as surgeons under the poor law, or assistant surgeons in the navy, or they commence practice in a small way (442)—that the distinction between medicine and surgery is as clear as between night and day (952). Dr. F. Hawkins: The charter requires that the elects should be examined, but they are not (996)—age is taken as the test of superior wisdom (997). Dr. H. Holland: The College of Physicians could not exist with a “One Faculty” (1510)—the relation between the higher ranks of the profession, and the higher class of society most important (1527)—insanity exceedingly prevalent amongst the higher classes, and hence the importance of an academical education to a physician (1530).

COLLEGE OF SURGEONS.

The Company of Barbers, or Barber Surgeons, was incorporated by Henry IV. In the third year of Henry VIII. it was enacted that no person should practise as a surgeon, within seven miles of London, unless approved of by the Bishop of London and the Dean of St. Paul's, who were assisted by four expert persons of the faculty; thus doing away with the exclusive practice of the barber-surgeons. In the 32nd of Henry VIII. the two companies were united by Act of

Parliament, under the title of the *Mystery and Commonalty* of the Barbers and Surgeons of London. A charter granted by James I. assumed to give the surgeons of the company an exclusive right of practising within three miles of London, and the charter of Charles I. extended this right to seven miles; but the effect of these charters was nullified by the right which the bishop and dean, with their co-examiners, possessed of examining all practisers of surgery in London. In the 18th of George II. the surgeons were constituted a separate company, and the power of the bishop and dean was repealed. In 1796, in consequence of the death of the master of the corporation, and the illness of another of the governors, a legal court could not be formed, and the corporation became dissolved. In the following year a bill was smuggled into Parliament and passed, giving this defunct corporation increased powers, with a monopoly of lecturing on surgery, &c. It had been twice read in the Lords, when the members discovered the iniquitous tendency of the measure, and by strenuous and combined efforts defeated it. Lord Thurlow called it "a miserable and wretched performance, in which the arrogance of the provisions maintained an equal contest with their absurdity." The corporate officials, however, had, *as at present*, more weight with the ministers and the king than the members; and George III., on the petition of the twenty-one old corporators, constituted them a "Court of Assistants," with power to elect their successors under the title of the Royal College of Surgeons in London. Matters proceeded as quietly as might be expected in these good old days of aristocratic rule, popular ignorance, and submission; but the acts of tyranny and oppression were too flagrant and frequent to allow even the obedient and peaceable members of the college to submit to them. They paid their money (£21.), were dubbed surgeons, and then their interest in the institution ceased. If they entered the college they were compelled to sneak in at the back door. The library and museum were closed to them; and the completion of the catalogues was neglected. The men who governed them were self-elected councillors and examiners, and had the means (as at present) of putting money into their pockets by compelling the students to pay for certificates at certain hospitals where they attended, and for lectures which they delivered; whilst they rejected certificates of attendance at the continental schools of greater value than their own, and refused to recognise the lectures of men who were infinitely their superiors in scientific and practical knowledge (Brooks, Bennett, King, Dermott, and Kiernan). The examinations, too, were disgraced by petty squabbles among the examiners, who had their crotchets and "examination dodges," which were better suited for a cock-pit than for a hall of science. Some who belonged to their own clique were let off with the searching question, "Pray, sir, with what instrument would you bleed?" But *medicine, midwifery, and pharmacy*? "Oh, no, they never mention them!" and there are now 1,600 members of this college practising medicine who have undergone no examination in this science, although nineteen-twentieths of their practice is medical.

Complaints, as at the College of Physicians, were constantly made by the members. Dr. Mason Good, in 1798, wrote two severe pamphlets against the college, condemning its exclusive laws, and

ridiculing the pure system of surgery. The *Lancet*, established in 1823, used its powerful pen with good effect; and in February, 1826, a large meeting of the members of the college (including Messrs. Wakley, Wardrop, Key, Lloyd, Kingdon, Welbank, Maelwain, and Tyrrell, who spoke on the occasion), took place at the Freemasons' Tavern, at which Mr. William Lawrence (a late president of the college) presided;—he had not then tasted the sweets of office. Mr. Lawrence denounced the infamous bye-laws, and the general acts of the college, in no measured terms; and no political harangue ever delivered by a member of our profession contained so much bitter sarcasm, such an exposure of corruption and corporate abuse, as the one in question.

In addition to the extracts we have already given (vol. I., p. 81,) we quote two or three of the more temperate remarks, which will apply equally to the *present state* of the college, and to the profession.

"The term 'Commonalty' must, of course, denote the *general* body of members."

"While the science has been extended, and its literature enriched abroad by the Mascagnis, the Caldanis and the Scarpas, by the Soemmerings, Walthers, Prochaskas, Reils, Tiedemanns, and Meckels, by the Bichats, Bécards, and Cloquets, we can hardly mention a single Englishman whose name is known as an anatomist beyond the shores of the island."

"Have you ever heard, gentlemen, of physiology? It is not mentioned in the college list of studies; an omission the more remarkable, as having been made in the very precincts of the magnificent temple, consecrated by the genius of Hunter to physiological science. Have you ever heard of pathology? of the changes produced by disease in the various structures and organs of our bodies, of the alterations in the living actions, of the causes that produce such changes, of the agents and circumstances capable of arresting them, and of restoring or preserving health; that is, of morbid anatomy, of *theoretical and practical medicine*, of therapeutics, of *materia medica* and *pharmacy*? These are altogether omitted. Two other serious omissions may be noticed. It is sufficient simply to mention *midwifery* and the connected subject diseases of women and children. No branch of medical science is more important."

I think that *all the honours and rewards*, which the profession can confer, should be open to *all* the members alike, without respect of *persons* or *classes*, and that the only distinctions which ought to be recognized are those which *talent and industry* may be capable of achieving for themselves."

The history of this college would be incomplete if we omitted to mention a circumstance that occurred in 1831. In the month of January, of this year, an admiralty order appeared, forbidding the attendance of naval surgeons and assistant-surgeons at the king's levees. The lords of the admiralty could not allow physic to "come between the wind and their nobility!" The profession was naturally indignant at this additional insult to the surgeons of the navy. Mr. Wakley, the editor of the *Lancet*, very properly suggested that the members should discuss the matter in their own college, before the delivery of the Hunterian oration, on the 14th of February. The grievance was discussed, and resolutions passed; but the council, not taking the interest in the subject that its importance demanded, it was recommended that the matter should be again brought forward before the delivery of the lecture on the 8th of March. The council forbade the discussion, and had a posse of police officers ready to take those into custody who disobeyed their orders. Mr. Wakley and others, in spite of the threat, moved resolutions. Mr. Wakley was dragged by

three police officers out of the theatre, amidst the most indescribable confusion. He gave Ledbitter, the officer in charge; preferred his complaint against him at Bow Street, but the case was dismissed. The council blustered—gave notice of action—but thought better of it. The objectionable order respecting the naval surgeons was quickly reseeded. We believe it never had the sanction of a *sailor king*.

In 1834 through the exertions of Mr. Warburton and others, a Parliamentary enquiry into the state of the medical profession took place, and we must refer the reader to the first volume of the "Examiner," (page 80) for a condensation of some of the evidence. A vast amount of abuse of power, and corporate selfishness was exposed before this committee, and some strange and startling evidence was given (2518).

"Sir E. Home inserted Hunter's manuscripts as his own, in the Philosophical Transactions, then burnt them; but was not censured by the college, and remained a trustee of the museum up to the time of his death, (5650). Sir B. Brodie would have the council elected by the upper grade only, and he considered surgery the most useful and scientific branch of the medical profession, (5677). Mr. Guthrie thought practitioners in midwifery should be excluded from the council (1770). Mr. W. Lawrence advocated an upper grade, the members of which should *elect the council and they only, should be eligible for hospital appointments, the general body to have no voice in the election of the council* (6085, 6089). These gentlemen would not attempt to suppress illegal practice. Sir C. Bell would intrust the selection of councillors to the *whole body* of the members and would not exclude *any class* from the council. The lower grade would beat the higher; early exertion and the absence of fortune gave vigour to intellect; he objected to grades, (5852, 5864)."

In May, 1837, Mr. Warburton stated in the House of Commons that he intended to introduce a bill, founded upon the Parliamentary evidence, for effecting important changes in the medical law, but Mr. Warburton after collecting his forces for the engagement, and contemplating the strength of the enemy, their ancient armour, burnished with modern brass, sheathed his sword and turned tail.

In December, 1836, the British Medical Association was formed, and one of its chief objects was the establishment of "One Faculty of Medicine," in each of the three kingdoms and the representative system of government; for these it petitioned the House of Commons. Amongst its founders were Drs. Webster, Marshall Hall, Grant, Granville, Green, Thompson, and Messrs. Liston, Grainger, Pileher, Farr, Wakley and the Editor of this Journal ("Lancet," 1837, p. 606). In 1839 the north of England Medical Association prayed for *uniformity* of education and examination, in the three kingdoms and the *representative* system of government. The Provincial Association numbering 2,000 members soon afterwards petitioned the house for similar laws, and many other petitions of a like character from various parts of England, Ireland, and Scotland were presented, but not one by the Corporators in favour of their system; *they worked in the dark*. We mention the above circumstances to show the general feeling of the profession respecting efficient medical reform, and how little the members of the legislature concerned themselves about the matter.

In 1843 it was rumoured that new charters were to be given to the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons, and the British Medical Association petitioned the Queen and Parliament that no charter should be

granted until the whole matter of medical reform had been fully discussed before Parliament. But dark and secret influence was too powerful, the voices of a few of the corporators were heard; the ministers were deaf to the thousands who had petitioned for *efficient* medical reform. This charter empowered the self-elected councillors of the College of Surgeons to select three hundred persons to be called fellows, and before twelve months to appoint "*any other member or members to be made fellows.*" Begging letters to the men who had the title to give away, poured in in abundance; some had cut for the stone, others for fistula, but *all* the applicants had supported the *dignity* of the college. Two hundred and forty-two fellows were added to the three hundred already made, but it will be observed that the *charter* did not limit the number,—the *council* did this!

The members chosen were generally those connected with hospitals and dispensaries; men who had been apprenticed to the pures, and had obtained their appointments through *private* interest and *money*, and the *generality of whom had undergone no examination in medicine, pharmacy, or midwifery.* The sequel of this obnoxious charter is too well known to the profession to need farther comment. It shows that a *few* of the medical attendants of the men in power have more influence than the *multitude.* It has led many in our profession to think that there must be something *radically* wrong in the constitution of our Parliament.

In August, 1844, Sir James Graham introduced his bill for the better regulation of Medical Practice. The chief features in this bill were the repeal of all charters; a Council of Health and Education, composed of physicians, surgeons, and of six other persons appointed by the crown; the registration in grades to be enforced; all the diploma shops to enjoy the same privileges. The apothecaries to be thrown overboard; no restriction to be put on illegal practice and quackery, but the Morrises, Solomons, and Edys to have full swing, and be allowed to add to the revenue. The cloven foot of monopoly is apparent in almost every clause of the bill. In May, 1845, the bill was introduced in an amended form. A College of General Practitioners was to be formed, and a candidate before examination to practise as a general practitioner was to have a *licence* from a board composed of six surgeons and six physicians. The bill was again amended, and after being botched, patched, and tinkered in various ways, was quietly disposed of.

In 1844 a National Association of General Practitioners was established, and nearly four thousand gentlemen enrolled themselves for the purpose of forming a National Institute of Medicine and Surgery, upon the representative principle; various communications were held with the corporate bodies, and a draft of a charter was proposed. Too many of the council, however, were mushroom reformers, who had not been chosen fellows of the College of Surgeons, and were reformers from *spite*, not from *principle.*

In August, 1846, Mr. Wakley introduced his Medical Registration Bill which enforced a general registration of medical practitioners and uniformity of education, qualification, and fees (diploma) throughout the kingdom. The *appointment of the Court of Examiners by the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons.* The bill was withdrawn in June, 1847.

In June, 1847, another committee formed to enquire into the laws of

the medical profession commenced its labors, and Messrs. *Brodie, Guthrie, and Lawrence* were again examined, and told nearly the same tale.

“*Mr. Laurence* did not know that the College of Surgeons had any privilege in the nature of a *monopoly* (1676). Medical practitioners are *properly registered* at the present time, (1703)—he did not think that the profession wanted *remodelling* (1748). Did not know of any hospital appointment being obtained by *improper means* (1857). That a council of health is *unnecessary*, and the system of the college answers *very well* indeed (1889, 1892). The Taunton pastrycook who passed the college examination (1846) was forty years of age, and came up with evidence of fifteen months' study (1900). The members of the college *too numerous* a body for election (1957). *Sir B. Brodie*, the examination as good as examinations *can be* (1997). The great mischief at present is the *cramming* for the *Apothecaries Hall* (2142). That the new charter has worked *well* (2157). The meetings of the council should not be *open* to the members (2687). What he called the *profession*, were men of *good sense* and *experience* (2688). *Mr. G. J. Guthrie* believes self-election is by far the *best way* of electing the council (5). Saw Lord Normanby and *Mr. Fox Maule* on the subject of the charter (6). *Army and navy surgeons* should be elected to the council (18). The number of fellows was limited to 542, because the *private advisers* of *Sir James Graham* thought it desirable (44). The public should employ *anybody they please*, qualified or *unqualified* (86). *Public examinations* not desirable. I am said to be the severest examiner and the most lenient judge (174). If my fellow examiner made one gentleman say so-and-so which I *did not like*, I made the *next man* say so-and-so, in the way I *did like* (80). Would have no examining bodies unconnected with *schools* (146). *Mr. J. H. Green*, the distinction of fellows and members not *invidious*, the only mistake was in the nomination of *too large* a number of the latter (2297, 2328). The establishment of a higher grade is an unmitigated good (2277). I should hardly say that there is a feeling among the *profession* (respecting popular election); there is among the *general practitioners* (2346). We should as little think of examining upon *medicine* as upon *theology* (2482). A single faculty would reduce the system of education to the *lowest* (2382). In many instances I have found young men incapable of *spelling*, and incapable of *comprehending* a considerable part of the lectures which were delivered to them, (2527). The College of Physicians *should examine* the *general practitioners* in medicine (2338).

We may conclude the history of this college in a few words. Since this evidence was given the council have been compelled from *poverty*, and the pressure from without, to make several concessions, but *all* in a higgling, miserly spirit. They cried right lustily at the onset of the fight, “No surrender, and grades for ever,” but they soon hoisted the white flag—

“Great actions are not always true sons
Of great and mighty resolutions.”

By their last concession they very graciously admit all to the fellowship, who have been deprived of corporate rights for 20 years, who will put 10 guineas into their empty chest; and who, *previous to the ballot*, can get their morality tested by three fellows, who have paid nothing for their freedom, and have given no proof of the *purity* of their own conduct.

We wrote to the council of this college, January 16, 1850 (as a member), to ask permission to inspect the accounts, and ascertain how the £234,322. 19s. had been spent, during the previous sixteen years? Our letter was noticed after four months, and the application refused. Although this *enormous* sum has been expended in this short period, the College has recently applied to the government (through *Sir H. Inglis* and the Bishop of London) for increased funds for the support of the Hunterian Museum, and as the general practitioner pays no income tax, and has plenty of superfluous cash, he will, we suppose submit to the grant without murmur or reproach? *Government*

responded to the call by a grant of £15,000. When brought before the notice of the House, not a single word was said against the transaction or the Minister.

THE SOCIETY OF APOTHECARIES.

The Apothecaries, or Poticaries as they were called, were formerly united with the grocers. In the reign of James the First they were separated from the grocers, and gradually acquired more importance; but they were, to a great extent, subordinate and subservient to the physicians, who had the power of increasing the amount of their profits by sending them their bills or prescriptions. So greatly had the practice of the apothecaries encroached upon that of the physicians, that it was customary, in the reign of Charles II., for some of the latter to supply their own medicines, without charge; or they ordered articles that could only be obtained of their own agents, so that the apothecaries might not copy their prescriptions. The physicians did not ask themselves whether 700,000 people required more than 100 medical attendants? but their *morality* consisted in endeavouring to keep all the profitable practice to themselves. The following extract from the college annals, dated March 1st., 1694, is very explanatory.

“ Dr. Torless reports that on hearing the city of London petition against the Apothecaries’ Bill, the Apothecaries’ counsel (by instructions from them) as the college committee were informed, did without reason or occasion given by the college, use very reflecting expressions against the members of it, as negligent, careless and uncharitable, indeed, making them of little use in comparison with the Apothecaries, who by reason of their great knowledge, skill, and care, which they very much enlarged upon, were more necessary, that they were, for the Apothecaries corrected the *errors* of the Physicians’ bills, *they had nineteen parts in twenty of practice of the practice of Physic in London*, and they took care of *all the sick poor and servants in and about London*, who must otherwise *perish without their assistance*; for the Doctors would not come to the poor *without fees*, nor to the rich *if at dinner or in bed*, whilst they came at all times and gave their *advice and physic to the poor for nothing*, with many other expressions of a like nature.”

At the commencement of the present century the general practitioners began to feel the necessity of compelling all who practised medicine to undergo an examination. Meetings were held; and one of the most active in the movement was Dr. Mason Good, who probably owed his rejection at the College of Physicians to the liberal part he had taken in medical politics. The first meeting of the Associated Apothecaries and Surgeon Apothecaries took place July, 1812, Dr. G. Mann Burrows in the chair. A petition to Parliament was prepared, asking that all apothecaries should be examined, &c. The Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons were applied to, but they both refused to have any thing to do with the examination of the general practitioners; and they threw every obstacle they could in the way of the Apothecaries’ Act, and were the means of rendering its provisions less useful and extensive than its originators intended. The Apothecaries’ Society stated that they would act only *under the directions* of the College of Physicians. The bill of 1812 was withdrawn; another, in 1814, after being mutilated in the House of Lords was also abandoned; and the present Act was only carried by a single vote on the third reading. At first the examination required was not of a very stringent character; but it is worthy of notice that this society, in 1815, required the student to attend *two* courses of anatomy, whilst the council of the College of Surgeons were satisfied with *one*. This company has gradually extended their curriculum; and their present political counter-move is for mathematics and Greek! But let the examination be equal to that of the Faculty of Medicine of Paris, the *name* spoils it, it acts like an emetic; and, as we have shown in our last number, some of the examiners even are ashamed of it.

This company possesses all the bad corporate monopolies of its elder brethren. It has, moreover, the additional stigma of a trading frater-

nity; the *members* deriving a profit from the sale of drugs; and no one who has not had this privilege for ten years can be an examiner. The company consists of a master, ^{who} wardens, and assistants. The examiners are elected by the assistants, ~~and~~ when chosen are generally 60 or 65 years of age. The licentiates are either privileged to practise in London or within seven miles, or in the country. The former pay ten guineas, the latter six. This the effect of the bad example set by the College of Physicians. To show the monstrous and absurd state of our medical laws, a member of this society may practise as a physician, but a physician cannot dispense his own medicine without being liable to a penalty.

This company exercises a despotic power, more worthy of the days of the Tudors. The recent refusal to recognize the lectures of Dr. Muspratt, of Liverpool, until shamed into the concession by the public press, is a good example of corporate abuse of power. But we terminate this history with a correspondence we have had with the worshipful Society, which speaks volumes:—

November 6th, 1850.

Sir,—As a *licentiate* of the Apothecaries' Company I beg to make the following enquiry. I find that since 1841, about £22,068 have been received by the Court of Examiners of the Apothecaries' Company, I am desirous (as a licentiate) to ascertain how this money has been expended, and how much the examiners have received for their duties, &c.

Oblige me by placing this letter before the proper authorities, and by informing me whether my request will be granted?

As the question is one that must interest every member of the Company, as well as the profession generally I shall make my answer public. If I do not hear from you before the 1st of December I shall conclude that my request is denied.

I am, Sir,

Henry Blatch, Esq., *Secretary.*

Your obedient Servant.

Apothecaries' Hall, 8th November, 1850.

Sir,—I am directed by the Master and Wardens to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 6th instant, stating your desire to ascertain how the money which has been received by the Society for certificates since the year 1841 has been expended, and how much the examiners have received for their duties, &c.

The Society are always ready to afford full information in reference to their expenditure of the funds which come to their hands in their administration of the Apothecaries' Act, when called upon to do so by competent authority, but they can hardly hold themselves bound to furnish such information at the instance of an individual licentiate of the Society.

For information generally on the subject of the receipts and expenditure of the Society, I beg to refer you to the returns which have been made from time to time by the Society to Parliament, and to the reports of the evidence given by members of the Society before successive Committees of the House of Commons on the subject of Medical Education.

I am, Sir, your most obedient Servant,

ROBERT B. UPTON,

Clerk to the Society.

November 10th, 1851.

Sir,—The answer I have received from the Master and Wardens of the Worshipful Company of Apothecaries is just the one I anticipated; it amounts to this—that the Licentiates have as much control over the affairs of the Company, as the inhabitants of Kamtschatka. The reports you refer to, do not afford the required information. I am desirous of knowing, how much of the sum mentioned has been received by the examiners?—How much has been spent in dinners?—How much in prosecuting quacks and unqualified practitioners?—How much in prosecuting Edinburgh graduates? and the amount expended in *scientific* purposes?

R. B. Upton, Esq.,

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant.

Clerk to the Society of Apothecaries.

In our next we will give, in a short space, some practical deductions from the above evidence, and take the liberty, at the same time, of asking the general practitioners of England a few plain questions, which they can answer as they please.

Some plain Questions to the General Practitioners of England, and the Editor's Plan of Medical Reform.

Before we put the questions we alluded to in our last number, we must place once more before the reader the *outlines* of the plan of medical reform we have advocated in the first volume of our journal (p. 30). That a Faculty of Medicine, composed of all the practitioners who have obtained diplomas in the United Kingdom, shall be formed in England, Ireland, and Scotland; and that the senate,* council, or governing board of the said faculty, shall be elected by the members of the various universities, colleges, and halls of the three kingdoms; the graduates of Universities, and the members of the Colleges of Physicians, electing the examiners in medicine and pathology; the members of the Colleges of Surgeons, the examiners in anatomy, physiology, and surgery, and the members of the Apothecaries' Company (from their own body); the examiners in chemistry, materia medica, botany, and midwifery. That the members of the senate, or examining board, shall receive a fixed salary, and shall not be teachers, nor derive any profit from the sale of hospital tickets or lectures. That a preliminary examination in mathematics and classics shall be instituted; and the examiners shall not be members of the medical profession. That the four subsequent examinations—1. In anatomy and physiology; 2. Chemistry, materia medica, botany, and midwifery; 3. Surgery; 4. Practice of medicine, pathology, and medical jurisprudence—shall be conducted in public; and shall be open to all legally-qualified practitioners. That the same curricula, and the same price for the diploma, shall be required in the three kingdoms; and that *all* who practise medicine and surgery after ——— shall obtain the degree of doctor of medicine and surgery from the faculty before they are entitled to registration. That the examinations for a few years shall be suited to the acquirements of the students; and that the expense of attendance on lectures and hospitals shall be so regulated by government as not to exclude the student of humble means, who is more likely, if a *fair* field is open to him, to advance medical science.

The reader will naturally ask what will become of the existing corporations? We answer, does their past history demand for them a moment's consideration? But to whom does the right belong—to the *thousands*, or to the *units*, who have usurped a power for their own aggrandisement, and not for the good of science? It will be observed that the establishment of a Faculty of Medicine, according to our plan, does not interfere directly with the vested rights of one of these corporations; but it gives to every member of university, college, or hall, the privilege of voting for the senate of the faculty in the country

* The examiners would form the senate, and would be composed of 20 in each country, including the non-medical examiners. They should receive £500. per annum; and the surplus from diplomas would be amply sufficient for the support of the faculty, including the library and museum.

where he obtained his degree. Thus a man who procured his diploma in Scotland, would only vote in that country; and those with English or Irish diplomas would enjoy the franchise in their respective colleges or universities.

In England the College of Surgeons might be converted into a Faculty of Medicine and Surgery. The Dublin College of Surgeons might be the seat of the Faculty in Ireland; and in Scotland the University of Edinburgh, or the College of Surgeons, might be the residence of the Faculty.

The Apothecaries' Companies of London and Dublin would still exist as trading corporations; and their present members would take their proper share in the formation of the senate or examining boards of the faculty. The universities would continue as schools of general education and medical instruction. The Colleges of Physicians, now poor and powerless, could not be in a worse condition; and those of London and Dublin might dispense with the examination farce, and like the Edinburgh College of Physicians, admit men by *one* ballot, without examination.

We scarcely need point out the advantages that a Faculty of Medicine would confer upon the medical student. Instead of being crammed as at present, for one examination, with "grinder's knowledge," he would have time to prepare for the various subjects, and obtain information that would not vanish as soon as acquired, but would serve him in time of need. The publicity of the examination would also ensure him fair-play; and would not allow the vagaries and erotehets of the examiners to operate to his prejudice. The faculty, would, moreover, give him a title and a position of which he need not be ashamed. But the great and lasting good of a Faculty of Medicine to the future generation would be the institution of the concours;—the destruction of the present system of nepotism and corruption in hospital appointments, so that the patrons of the Lord Noodles and of the Aldermen Stenches would not enumber the Temple of Science, and close the gates to her true worshippers. The poor and industrious student might then, like the great men we have pointed to in France, achieve a position and a title more worthy of respect and honour than the *hereditary* bauble of duke or marquis.

Those who are anxious to keep up the present distinctions and grades will find a thousand objections to the above proposal.* Dr. Holland said, in his Parliamentary evidence, that the College of Physicians could not exist with a "One Faculty" (1510). Mr. Joseph Henry Green said that a single faculty would reduce the system of education to the *lowest*; but, nearly in the same breath, he so stultified his evidence as to assert that young men were incapable of *spelling*, and of *comprehending*, a considerable part of the lectures delivered to them (2527)!!

We now ask the general practitioners of England (and in addressing

* We do not for a moment insinuate that these gentlemen did not give their evidence conscientiously, and to the best of their abilities; but we believe that they all have a corporate bias, and a hankering after grades and clubs. As we have observed before, when a parson looked through a microscope he saw a church, a lady saw two lovers, and a city alderman beheld Smithfield market, but smelt nothing.

ourselves to this class we speak to the great bulk of the medical profession in the three kingdoms who practise medicine, surgery, and midwifery), the questions we have before spoken of :—

1. Is there one amongst you who can suppose, like Mr. J. H. Green, that a Faculty of Medicine would reduce the system of education to the *lowest*? Would it not, on the other hand, elevate the character of our profession, and produce such a bond of unity and brotherhood as would obtain for us, as a body, that public respect which from our internal dissensions, clubs, sections, and grades, is now withheld from us?

2. Can the general practitioner suppose that the plan of reform contemplated by the Colleges of Surgeons and Physicians, to fill their empty coffers, will improve his name and position? If he has read the Annals of the London College of Physicians, and our history of this corporation, can he find one redeeming feature—one bright spot in the dark and gloomy retrospect? Is there the slightest exaggeration in the petition presented by Mr. Hume to the House of Commons, in 1832, by the British physicians, “as to the probable amount of lives prematurely destroyed in 300 years by the culpable inactivity of this college?” Can the general practitioner read the annals we have placed before him, and the more recent acts of this body, and desire to submit to its yoke? Is not the late warning of Professor Syme, of Edinburgh, who may be considered an impartial witness, worthy of attention? These are his words, in his letter to the Lord Advocate of Scotland, on Medical Reform, 1850, “It is hardly necessary to remark that a college which supported their president in, and identified themselves with, the perpetration of such an outrage on decency and propriety (the Swiney Cup adjudication, by three office-bearers of the college), could be safely trusted with any power of controlling the members of a liberal profession?”

3. Should not the past and present history of the College of Surgeons teach the general practitioner a useful lesson? If the council, in their memorial to Sir G. Grey, July 22, 1850, said “that those who practise pharmacy (and this applies to nineteen-twentieths of the profession) have been *immemorially designated as apothecaries*,” is it to be wondered at that the *Times*, the leading journal of the day, should designate the general practitioner Mr. Camomile, call his residence Rhubarb Hall, and insult his page, with “bright buttons,” by insinuating that the quantity of medicine he delivers is in proportion to the swallow of the patient, and the capacity of his stomach? Is it surprising, moreover, that a late writer in Blackwood (June) should apply to the general practitioner the dignified epithet of Dr. Dosewell?

4. If Sir B. Brodie (Parliamentary evidence, 1847, (2688) said, “what he called the *profession* were men of good sense and experience;” and Mr. J. H. Green, another president of this college, excludes the general practitioner (who has passed the same examination as himself, and in addition has mostly a medical diploma) from the rank of a professional man (2346), what will be his *position* and *name* when he of the *lower* grade, as he is now called, is examined solely by the *higher*?

5. If ten years ago the *members* of the College of Surgeons were required to be *six* years engaged in the acquirement of surgical

knowledge, why has the term now been reduced to *five years*? and how did the Taunton pastrycook, and other members, obtain their *surgical* knowledge?

6. Is there any reason why a man, who is unable to read and write, may not now become a member of this college? A celebrated London grinder, an M.D. of the University of London, and a Fellow of the College of Surgeons, is in the habit of telling his pupils "that he would prepare a matchmaker for the college examination in three months!"

7. What part have these colleges taken against quackery and illegal practice?—the oppressions under the Poor Law?—the insults to naval surgeons?—the insurance offices?—the sale of poisons, and other sanitary improvements?

8. How many mesmerists, hydropathists, homœopathists, and quacks, are there connected with both colleges?

9. Is it not notorious that a fellow or licentiate of the College of Physicians may meet any of the above without infringing the bye-law, provided they are members of the college, or in general practice; and is it not, also, notorious, that this fellow or licentiate would be liable to a penalty of £5. for meeting a London physician who is not a member of their college, although his experience and practical knowledge might be greatly superior to their own?

10. What good reason can be assigned why *every* member of a university, college, or hall, as recommended by the late Sir Charles Bell and Mr. Key, should not enjoy the right of voting for the council or senate?

11. Is it not monstrous that if the charters of the Veterinary College and the Pharmaceutical Society give their members this right, that it should be denied to the more intelligent members of the medical profession?

12. If Mr. Bell's Pharmaceutical Bill should become law, and chemists and druggists are to be called pharmacutists or chemists, will they not possess a more scientific name than that of "apothecary," with which the Colleges of Surgeons and Physicians have branded the general practitioner?

13. If the general practitioner should fall into this college net, the strings of which are pulled by various provincial and metropolitan touters of the upper-grade, and by editors of the same *species*, what *genus* is he to belong to? How will he be classified in foreign catalogues? Where will be his habitat? Will he be satisfied to serve two masters, and to pay for his situation, as a college flunkey? or will he not rather become a member of one brotherhood or faculty, where he will take his proper position, and be properly represented?

14. Can the general practitioners expect *efficient* reform from the present government? and will it not be desirable for him, at the next general election, which is near at hand, to combine with his brethren—to form committees in every district of England—to sacrifice political feeling for the good of his profession, and for the advancement of science—and to vote and give his interest only to those candidates who will support a liberal measure of medical reform?

The 20,000 practitioners of England can effect this if they will—the game is in their own hands. Let them begin to think and act for themselves, and be no longer bamboozled and humbugged by upper-grade

touters, whose sole object is, and ever has been, the degradation of the general practitioner—the perpetuation of the race of “*respectable apothecaries!*”

A fact worthy of consideration at the present crisis.

In our sketches of the London Hospitals (vol. I., p. 205), we stated that we were not acquainted with a single hospital physician or surgeon who had left money to these institutions, although their fortunes have generally been made by means of these establishments. It is true that many of them paid handsomely for their whistle in the first instance; and others, by jackall subserviency and intrigue, had to work hard to attain the summit of their ambition. The surgeon who paid £1,000. for his hospital apprenticeship got good interest for his money; for at some of the larger hospitals his receipts for lectures and hospital entries amounted to £600. or £700 per annum, besides the increase of practice from the patients sent to him by his pupils, and the oft-quoted allusion to “the cases in our hospital.”

It is natural to suppose that the high morality of one or two out of the multitude of the pures who have so long had the hospital field to themselves, and who in their blind self-sufficiency boast of its fruits, would have induced them to have added a codicil to their wills for the benefit of the sick and maimed, or a few hundreds might have been left for the establishment of prizes, or for other scientific purposes; but no such beneficence, gentle reader, from this quarter. Poor Dr. Swiney, an unknown Scotch physician, although evidently of weak intellect, had reason enough left to *desire* to benefit medical science, and some of those connected with his Alma Mater; but, alas, for college justice and impartiality.

Jackson, the founder of the Jacksonian Prize which bears his name, and Drs. Fothergill and Lettsom, the donors of the Fothergillian Médal, were none of them attached to an hospital. Fothergill, who was a Quaker, and a most charitable and excellent man, would have been excluded on account of his religious tenets, as was Dr. Hodgkin recently from Guy's Hospital.

Sir A. Cooper left a triennial prize of £300. ; but as if conscience-smitten at the nepotism which had prevailed at the borough hospitals, he added the proviso, “that no person connected with these hospitals, nor any person related by blood or affinity to any such physician or surgeon, or other officer for the time being, shall at any time be entitled to claim the prize.”

We have been led to the above reflections in consequence of two magnificent bequests that have recently been made in France by Drs. Jecker and Merat to the Academy of Sciences, the Institute, and to the Parisian Hospitals. The bequest of the former gentleman amounts to £28,000. Some may attribute these donations to the influence of the Catholic religion; but Guy, and a hundred other Englishmen we could name, were not Catholics. If we had a Faculty of Medicine, and if places and honors were open to all, we believe that many donations from the members of our profession, similar to those in France, would be recorded. A man now would not be simpleton

enough to leave his money for the benefit of a club, or for the institution of a prize that might be given to the undeserving; but why some of our London hospital physicians and surgeons have not supported with their money the cradles that rocked them into place and fortune, is a question that we leave for the reader's cogitation?

The Harveian Oration.

We notice this oration (which was delivered on the 5th inst.) at an earlier period than usual, for the purpose of making known to our readers a discovery of the orators which may have an important bearing on medical practice. Dr. Spurgin's researches have led him to the conclusion, "that as history furnishes an instance of the total obliteration of the coronary arteries of the heart, the blood flows through the foramina in the parietes, and that the other vessels stand in relation to the veins." We extract this from the *Morning Post*, and our excuse for making the disclosure is, that as far as we know, "*It is the only instance in the history of Harveian Orations where the orator has been able to announce a discovery, or a supposed discovery, of his own.*"

We shall review the oration hereafter, when it is placed before us in a proper shape; suffice it to say, for the present, that according to the *Post*, it was more "scholarly in diction than its predecessors, and that it concluded amidst the plaudits of an erudite audience." The *Chronicle* speaks of a portion of the oration on truth, which bears a great resemblance to a certain passage of Lord Bacon's; and other journals mention the high *moral* and *religious* feeling inculcated by the orator, who, we venture to assert, did not attempt to give the college a definition either of *truth* or *morality*—and why should he? It would puzzle the greatest philosophers and lexicographers the world ere saw. Lord Bacon defined both truth and morality; but his acts belied his words. The acumen of the learned president of the college, and of the fellows who were present, would scarcely penetrate the temporal signification of these terms. Cicero, who, like Bacon, did not quite practise what he preached, says, *Quod verum, simplex, sincerumque est, id naturæ hominis est aptissimum*. Horace found truth in wine. Some philosophers have said it must be searched for at the bottom of a well. The hydropathist would find it in a tub, or a wet sheet; the mesmerist in sympathy; the homœopathist in an atom; Messrs. Morrison and Holloway in pills innumerable, and ointments profitable; whilst the aristocratic member of our Board of Health, the Earl of Carlisle, like some fish we could name, nibbles at two baits—is caught by the decillionth part of the shadow of Hahnemann in the morning; and in the evening, despising aconite and infinitesimals, he quaffs allopathic doses of Falernian to the portly and "*corporate*" Saint Mary!

But preferring, like the orator, Dr. Spurgin, the analytical mode of investigation to the synthetical, we finish this article with a quotation concerning truth from that renowned philosopher and wag, Butler, in Hudibrastic verse, who thus speaks of public discernment:—

"The world is nat'rally averse
To all the *truth* it sees and hears;
But swallows nonsense and a lie
With greediness and gluttony."

The Meetings of the Provincial Association.

Now that some of these meetings have already occurred, and the great gathering of the members of the Association is fixed at Brighton, for the 13th of next month, a few words to the members will not, we think, be inappropriate at the present juncture. Admitting, as we have done, the benefit that this Association has conferred upon medical science, we have not been sparing in our remarks respecting the political movements of the body, or rather the small part of the body, the upper limbs, that have scarcely, without opposition, led the rest of the members by the nose. "Mr. A. will support *any* measure that his friend, Dr. B., proposes. Mr. H. will vote either way. Mr. C. wishes medical reform at the bottom of the sea, it will never put money into his pocket; and, as for his sons, why let them take care of themselves, as *he* has done, and as *his* father did before him. Mr. D. puts his name to a petition, and he supposes it's all right; but he tells his friend, the requisitionist, that he is just as likely to sign the other way. Mr. W. asks, like the donkey with the panniers, whose master told him to gallop when the French were coming, will medical reform take the load off my back? will it rob me of the income-tax? or soften the hearts of the Poor Law Commissioners? Whilst Mr. O. says the council of the Association are a set of humbugs, and he won't go near them."

As we are anxious that the members should begin to *think* for themselves, we must bring to their notice once more the political principles of this Association, which have been advocated for many years, viz.:—"Uniform and sufficient qualification in every branch of medical science; equal right for all so qualified to practise throughout her Majesty's dominions, and the adoption of the representative principle in the formation of the councils or governing bodies."

In addition to these *fundamental* principles of the Society, the district branches generally pray for one portal for all, one incorporation, one uniform standard of education, and the representative form of government. Can the reader, if these principles are fully carried out, make anything but a Faculty of Medicine of them?

In the last memorial to Sir G. Grey, signed on behalf of the Association by Sir C. Hastings and Mr. Shepherd, the council express their approbation of the conciliatory resolutions of the College of Surgeons, adopted on the 10th and 24th of March last; but, at the same time, they *faintly* remind Sir G. Grey that they have always contended for the election of the council of the College of Surgeons by *all* the members of respectability and good character. They, moreover, pray for new charters for the Colleges of Surgeons and Physicians; and then advise a joint board of Physicians and Surgeons, with the aid, if *necessary*, of competent examiners in midwifery and pharmacy, to examine all who enter the medical profession. The reader, who has not studied the movements of the political machine as we have done, will exclaim, what can be more reasonable and liberal than this proposition? Here is a Faculty of Medicine at once, on the representative system! Bah! does he know the past history of these colleges? their power with the legislators of the country? their upper-grade supporters, and their Jesuitical professions?

Will these corporations countenance *one portal* and *uniformity* of qualification and title when all their proceedings have exhibited their predilection for *grades*? Will they give the general practitioner a *name* and a *home*? Will this scheme abate the evil one jot, if the same law is not applied to Ireland and Scotland? Does the Worcester

council desire that the general practitioner should enter the classic halls of the College of Physicians—talk Latin with the president—catch a glimpse of the Swiney Cup and the bust of Harvey—get a mesmeric touch of upper-degradism—and then quit this aristocratic region of clubs, ballot-boxes, and fountains, for ever? Orpheus was not worse treated! Let the *members* of the Provincial Association consider these things, and not find themselves between two stools that will put them in the dirt. Let them take care that the one portal is not a postern-gate.

The Pharmacy Bill and its Defects.

Our readers are aware that one essential part of our plan of medical reform is the *proper* education and examination of chemists and druggists (vol I., Appendix, p 31). That men who dispense potent and deadly medicines, the tenth part of a grain of which may make the difference between life and death, should know something of the properties of these medicines; and that members of the swell-mob, and others of the same fraternity, should not take the title of chemist and druggist, and supply their associates with chloroform and other deleterious substances. Entertaining these views, which must be common to all the members of the medical profession, we hailed with pleasure Mr. Bell's bill for regulating the qualifications of pharmaceutical chemists: but we have an additional motive for rejoicing at the introduction of this measure, viz., that if the druggists progress, the general practitioners cannot stand still; the body, now in a cataleptic condition, will be stimulated from its lethargy by pharmaceutical preparations—shamed into energy by scientific names.—*Pharmaceutical Chemist versus Apothecary!*

Although *medical* reform, like the wheel of Ixion, is constantly in motion, it makes but little progress; our corporate Gods, assisted by the Jupiters of the Senate House, and the Tritons of the provinces, are not averse to this quiet and perpetual evolution of *medical* politics. No sooner, however, does Mr. Bell, who is not fettered by *time-honoured institutions*, introduce his Pharmacy Bill into the House of Commons, than it progresses with Mercury-like speed; obtains a second reading; and the honourable member for Finsbury is so enamoured of it that he would pass it at once, “as there has been no opposition to it.”

But let us now enquire whether the measure, in its *present shape*, should be allowed to pass the legislature? Although, as we have said before, highly approving of the general principles of the bill, we especially object to pharmacutists and chemists (so-called) being allowed to sell quack medicines and other poisons for the benefit of the government, and to the detriment of the public. But our greatest objection to the bill, in its present form, is that not word is said about illegal practice. It is notorious that half the profits of many chemists and druggists arise from what is called counter-prescribing; and that they obtain the practice which should devolve upon the young medical practitioner. Men in our profession, of humble means, are often *compelled*, in self-defence, to keep open shops for the purpose of obtaining patients, which they might acquire without blue-bottles, if druggists were kept within their proper bounds. If the *pharmaciens* of France are limited to certain duties, why should not those of England be restricted? These matters must be looked to. In our next we will continue this subject, and point out some of the errors of Mr. Bell's speech (House of Commons, July 3rd), when he moved the second reading of the Pharmacy Bill.